

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 8, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as allegedly anticipated by Luzeski. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, "executing a script included in the attached electronic file to execute a document view program displaying an instruction message for accessing content and displaying a launch control icon; and responsive to a selection of the launch control, displaying the content intended for delivery to the recipient of the electronic mail message by using the identity to establish a connection with the remote server computer."

Luzeski does not teach all these features. In Luzeski, upon accessing an attachment with a pointer to a Uniform Resource Locator (URL), there is no teaching that a script included in the attached electronic file is executed to provide a launch control and a recipient selects a launch control to further enable the accessing of the remote content. Columns 20-21 of Luzeski relate to receiving and opening an email, which may contain a pointer to an attachment (column 20, lines 43-46). There is no teaching in Luzeski, however, that a script is executed to display an instruction message and a launch control icon as recited in claim 1. Thus, Luzeski fails to teach the features of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Luzeski. Claims 2-4, and 7 depend from claim 1, and are patentable over Luzeski for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Luzeski. Claims 5 and 6 variously depend from claim 1 and are considered patentable over Luzeski for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claims 8-12 were rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-7. Claim 8 includes features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Thus, claim 8 is patentable over Luzeski. Claims 9-12 depend from claim 8 and are patentable over Luzeski for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 8.

98048C1  
BLL-0066C

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox  
Registration No. 38,807  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

Date: January 9, 2006

98048C1  
BLL-0066C